

Fisher's arrow of 'time' in cosmological coherent phase space

B. Roy Frieden^{†1} and H.C. Rosu^{‡2}

[†] *Optical Sciences Center, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721, USA*

[‡] *Instituto de Física de la Universidad de Guanajuato, Apdo Postal E-143, León, Gto, México*

Abstract

Fisher's arrow of 'time' in a cosmological phase space defined as in quantum optics (i.e., whose points are coherent states) is introduced as follows. Assuming that the phase space evolution of the universe starts from an initial squeezed cosmological state towards a final thermal one, a Fokker-Planck equation for the time-dependent, cosmological Q phase space probability distribution can be written down. Next, using some recent results in the literature, we derive an information arrow of time for the Fisher phase space cosmological entropy based on the Q function. We also mention the application of Fisher's arrow of time to stochastic inflation models.

PACS number(s): 98.80.Hw

Keywords: Fisher's arrow

Honorable Mention at Gravity Research Foundation Essay Contest for 1997

revised December 1997, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 13 (1998) 39-46

¹E-mail: friedenr@super.Arizona.edu

²E-mail: rosu@ifug3.ugto.mx

There has long been much interest in understanding the origin of time-asymmetry of the Universe, i.e., the occurrence of definite arrows of time [1]. In this paper we give arguments for introducing a Fisher arrow of ‘time’ (where ‘time’ is an intrinsic time which is an unknown function of the foliation time, see below) based on (i) the existence of a Fokker-Planck equation in the phase space of cosmological coherent states for the Q representation of the density operator and (ii) cosmological evolution starting from a squeezed state to a final thermal one. Indeed, quantum gravity and quantum cosmology (in the sense of quantum fluctuations in the very early Universe) cannot escape quantum-optical phase space approaches [2], which have proven so useful in both pure and applied physics ever since the first phase space formulations of quantum mechanics have been given by Wigner in 1932 and Husimi in 1940. In the area of quantum optics there has been substantial progress precisely as an outcome of the c-number phase space quasi-distribution functions (representing a solution of the operator ordering problem for coherent states) such as the P function introduced by Glauber and Sudarshan at the beginning of the sixties. The seventies, and in a much greater extent the eighties, brought in the remarkable squeezed (non-classical) states [3], of promising technological potential in optical communication and high-precision interferometry. At the same time, the squeezing formalism may be quite efficient in interpreting the cosmological scales. This can be seen as follows. One way to produce squeezed states is by parametric amplification due to the parametric coupling with the pump field. On the other hand, in one of the first contributions to quantum cosmology, Zel’dovich [4] pointed on the analogy of cosmological particle production and the parametric amplification of classical waves, and Grishchuk [5] actually suggested the variable gravitational cosmic background acting similar to the pump field in the laboratory squeezing. At present, the one-to-one correspondence between the equations of the relic gravitons and those of quantum optics is well known and it has been argued that some predictions of gravitation theory can be tested in the laboratory by quantum optics experiments [6]. Although Grishchuk and Sidorov [7] discussed plainly the cosmological squeezing of the relic graviton spectrum, the squeezing approach is not employed by many authors as yet [8]. This is partly due to the opinion that the squeezing formalism is not promoting any new physics. Despite this reticency, very recently,

Feinstein and Pérez Sebastián [9] went as far as describing the birth of the universe out of “nothing” in terms of quantum squeezing, presenting the Casher-Englert tunneling entropy [10] in the squeezing framework.

In the following, we shall pay particular attention to the Q representation of the cosmological density matrix, which is defined in terms of squeezed coherent boson states $|\alpha\rangle$. These quantum states are thought of as a classical-like representation of the quantum fluctuations in the early Universe and having well-defined amplitude and momentum are the best analogues of points in the phase space [11], which is considered to be a locally compact, Hausdorff topological space. They fulfill the decomposition of unity $\int d^2\alpha |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| = \pi$ and lead to $Q(\alpha) \equiv \frac{1}{\pi}\langle\alpha|\hat{\rho}|\alpha\rangle$. Since the Q function is positive by definition, can always be thought of as a probability distribution on phase space, not as the Wigner function or the Glauber-Sudarshan P function, which are only quasi-distributions obeying pseudo-Fokker-Planck (FP) equations, i.e., FP equations with a non-positive definite diffusion matrix [12]. Moreover, the Q function has been shown to be the probability distribution for the statistics in a particular model of simultaneous measurements of position and momentum [14]. Although the arguments in the following are general and independent of any particular cosmological scenario, we mention that the dispersion of these Gaussian states can be written as in [13]

$$\sigma^{-2}(t(\tau)) = \frac{p}{2} \left(\frac{\cosh r(t(\tau)) + e^{2i\varphi(t(\tau))} \sinh r(t(\tau))}{\cosh r(t(\tau)) - e^{2i\varphi(t(\tau))} \sinh r(t(\tau))} \right), \quad (1)$$

where p is a model dependent parameter, $t(\tau)$ (henceforth also t) is an intrinsic time expressed as a so far unknown function of the conformal time τ , r is the squeeze parameter, and φ is the squeeze phase. Furthermore, in the case of relic gravitons (see below), Grishchuk and Sidorov [7] used Eq. (1) with $t(\tau) = \tau$ and derived the formula $p = \sqrt{n^2 - 1} - a^2$, where $n = 2\pi R/\lambda$ is an index labeling the graviton modes representing nontrivial solutions of a Schrödinger-like equation, and a is the dimensionless scale factor connected with the physical one, R , by $a = (3\pi/2)^{1/2}(R/l_p)$, with l_p the Planck length. The essential point now is that the time evolution of the Q function is governed by a Fokker-Planck equation that can be obtained from the well-

known FP equation for the Glauber-Sudarshan P function. It reads [15]

$$\partial_t Q = \left[\frac{\gamma}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \alpha + \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha^*} \alpha^* \right) + D \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha \partial \alpha^*} \right] Q \equiv L_{FP} Q, \quad (2)$$

where γ is the drift coefficient and D is the diffusion one, which turns out to be $\gamma(\bar{n} + 1)$, where $\bar{n}$ is the mean number of quanta. As we said the intrinsic time t is a model dependent function of the conformal time. Since the FP kinetic evolution is crucial for the arguments in the following we add from the book of Davies [16] some basic mathematical structure that is implied by such an assumption. Essentially, the requirement that the initial value problem be well-posed implies that the FP solutions (as those of any other kinetic equation) should define a Markov semigroup, i.e., a continuous, positivity and normalization preserving one-parameter semigroup of operators on the space of complex-valued continuous functions in phase space. This is a mathematical terminology stemming from the fact that such semigroups are in one to one correspondence with (time-homogeneous) stochastically continuous Markov processes described by a transition probability distribution, which is a probability Borel measure on the phase space. With some further mathematical conditions (like the so-called Lindenberg condition on the transition probability distribution) it can be shown that the generator of the Markov semigroup has the FP form with the diffusion and drift coefficients related to the first two moments of the transition probability distribution of the corresponding Markov process. When mathematicians are speaking about ‘time-homogeneous’ stochastic processes, by time they understand an intrinsic, physical time that may be for example a Bohmian time [17]. However, one can employ the Bohmian time only for rough estimates of the semi-classical tunneling time through a classically forbidden region of the cosmological scale factor as in fact some authors did since in the same tunneling process the conversion of a parametric (foliation) time variable into an intrinsic time takes place [18, 19]. Thus, it appears that in order to get the function $t(\tau)$ one should perform a detailed analysis of the cosmological semi-classical tunneling. Assuming all this as a background for the FP equation (2), it can be applied to at least three cosmological scenarios as follows.

(i) *Gravitons*: since the inflationary amplification of the vacuum fluctuations leads to gravitons in a final “squeezed vacuum” quantum state, one can study the phase space evolution of the squeezed vacuum towards the thermal equilibrium.

(ii) *Tunneling approaches*: one can also consider the phase space evolution of the squeezed state emerging after the tunneling out from “nothing” [9].

(iii) *Electromagnetic fluctuations*: an entirely electromagnetic origin of the cosmic microwave anisotropy recently detected by the Cosmic Background Explorer (COBE) [20] has been shown to be allowed by realistic stringy cosmologies [21]. In such a case, the cosmological coherent phase space is a more complicated form of the quantum optical phase space.

Taking into account all these possibilities, we shall keep our discussion at the general quantum optical level, since as for the case of relic gravitons, the connection with various cosmological scenarios is merely a matter of inferring the function $t(\tau)$. Assuming an initial squeezed state evolving to a thermal one, a solution of Eq. (2) has been obtained by Keitel and Wódkiewicz in the form [15]

$$Q_s(\alpha, t) = \exp[a_s(t)|\alpha|^2 + b_s(t)(\alpha^2 + \alpha^{*2}) + c_s(t)\alpha + c_s^*(t)\alpha^* + N_s(t)] , \quad (3)$$

where the subscript s stands for squeezing, $n(t) = (\bar{n} + 1)(1 - e^{-\gamma t})$, while the rather cumbersome expressions of the time-dependent functions a_s, b_s, c_s, N_s are given in [15] and will not be reproduced here. An important property of the FP evolution is to preserve the Gaussian character of the initial state. This holds for any normalized Gaussian function of the type given in Eq. (3), with arbitrary a, b, c, N not necessarily as given in [15], fulfilling only the restrictions $a(t) < 0$, $2|b(t)| < |a(t)|$ and $N(t)$ determined from the normalization of Q . It can be checked [15] that $Q_s(\alpha; \infty) \equiv Q_{thermal} = \frac{1}{\pi(\bar{n}+1)} \exp[-\frac{|\alpha|^2}{(\bar{n}+1)}]$.

Let us pass now to the Fisher information defined as the volume integral $I \equiv \int \frac{\nabla p \cdot \nabla p}{p} dV$ that can be introduced for any system characterized by a probability distribution p . It has been shown to provide interesting insights in theoretical physics by one of the authors [22]. This information quantity is the scalar trace of the Fisher information matrix [23]. Arguments for a Fisher’s information “H-theorem” have been recently advanced [24], having been turned more sound by a direct proof due to Plastino and Plastino [25]. We shall sketch in the following the phase space analog of Plastinos’ proof for an arrow of time based on I . The adjoint operator

L_{FP}^+ is defined according to

$$L_{FP}^+ = \left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \alpha + \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha^*} \alpha^* \right) \frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha \partial \alpha^*} D \right]. \quad (4)$$

Given two probability distributions Q_1 and Q_2 , there exists the relationship

$$\int Q_1(L_{FP} Q_2) d^2 \alpha = \int Q_2(L_{FP}^+ Q_1) d^2 \alpha. \quad (5)$$

To any pair of solutions Q_1, Q_2 , one associates the auxiliary quantity

$$F = \int Q_1^2 Q_2^{-1} d^2 \alpha, \quad (6)$$

leading to the following relationship for its rate of change

$$\frac{dF}{d\tau} = 2 \int q(L_{FP} Q_1) d^2 \alpha - \int Q_2(L_{FP}^+ q^2) d^2 \alpha, \quad (7)$$

where $q = \frac{Q_1}{Q_2}$. After some manipulations, one is led to the relationship

$$\frac{dF}{dt} = -2 \int Q_2 D \frac{\partial q}{\partial \alpha} \frac{\partial q}{\partial \alpha^*} d^2 \alpha. \quad (8)$$

Since Q_2 and D are positive quantities one gets

$$\frac{dF}{dt} \leq 0. \quad (9)$$

Let us consider now a family of normalized probability distributions $Q_\theta = Q(\alpha; t, \theta)$, depending upon a parameter θ , all of them being solutions of the FP equation (2). Assuming L_{FP} as a θ -independent linear operator, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{\partial Q_\theta}{\partial \theta} \right) = L_{FP} \left(\frac{\partial Q_\theta}{\partial \theta} \right). \quad (10)$$

In this way, $\frac{\partial Q_\theta}{\partial \theta}$ is itself a solution of the FP equation (not necessarily a normalized, positive-definite one). Using the definition of Fisher's information I_θ as follows

$$I_\theta = \int \frac{1}{Q_\theta} \left(\frac{\partial Q_\theta}{\partial \theta} \right)^2 d^2 \alpha \quad (11)$$

and substituting Q_1 by $\frac{\partial Q_\theta}{\partial \theta}$ and Q_2 by Q_θ in equation (6), comparison with equations (8) and (9) leads to

$$\frac{dI_\theta}{dt} \leq 0. \quad (12)$$

This result may be called the ‘I-theorem’, by analogy with Boltzmann H-theorem. It states that the Fisher information of the universe (actually of any physical system obeying a FP equation) can only decrease (or remain constant) in physical time.

A simplified proof [26] is based on the fact that Fisher I is actually the cross-entropy between $Q(\alpha)$ and $Q(\alpha+d\alpha)$. It is known, see e.g., Risken’s book [12], that the cross-entropy obeys $\frac{dI}{dt} \leq 0$, if Q obeys a true (i.e., the diffusion coefficient nonnegative) FP equation. This is independent of the parameter θ of the other proof.

The aforementioned applications of Fisher’s arrow of ‘time’ to various cosmological scenarios are not the only ones. In an even more direct way, ‘I-theorem’-like statements can be easily introduced in the stochastic approach to models of eternal inflation, as discussed for example by Winitzki and Vilenkin [27]. These models are based on FP equations for an inflaton probability distribution $P(\phi, t)d\phi$ which is interpreted as the (either comoving or physical) volume of regions with a particular value of the inflaton scalar field in the infinitesimal interval $d\phi$. Winitzki and Vilenkin employed a time variable t , which is related to the proper time τ by

$$dt = [H(\phi)]^{1-\alpha} d\tau, \quad (13)$$

where α is called the physical dimension of t , taking the value $\alpha = 1$ for the proper time parametrization, and $\alpha = 0$ for the scale time; $H(\phi)$ is the Hubble inflaton constant, proportional to the square root of the inflaton potential.

On the other hand, when introducing Fisher’s arrow of ‘time’ in Wheeler-DeWitt quantum cosmologies one is faced with the ambiguity of defining a time variable, or in other words, with the famous problem of time [28] (not to mention the related issue of the emergence of time), which is a truly fundamental problem not only of cosmology but of physics in general. So the question is: Does an arrow of time make any sense for the common quantum cosmological framework based on the Wheeler-DeWitt equation, which being a stationary, zero energy differential equation appears to have no obvious time dependence and therefore forcing one to invent clock models. The point is that introducing an arrow of ‘time’ means merely introducing irreversibility in quantum cosmology. It has been suggested to us by the Referee that irreversibility in a rigorous sense is given by an underlying semigroup structure of the Lax-Phillips scattering type [29]. This

proposal is reasonable and can be matched to the Wheeler-DeWitt equation only if one thinks of the ‘wavefunction of the universe’ solution as similar to a zero-energy resonance (also known as a half-bound state, and possible only for zero angular momentum) in ordinary quantum scattering. The zero-energy resonance wavefunction is zero at the arbitrary chosen cosmological origin, is finite at infinity, and is not normalizable. Therefore, scattering concepts can be applied to it [30].

Coming back to the ‘I-theorem’, another interesting byproduct is provided by the Cramér-Rao inequality for the mean square error e^2 of an unbiased estimator $e^2 \geq I^{-1}$, indicating that even in the presence of efficient estimation (i.e., Cramér-Rao equality) *the quality of estimates must decrease with the time parameter*. This seems to be a reasonable alternative way of stating the second law of thermodynamics in this context [31]. This conclusion refers to processes for which the necessary ingredients to the FP equation are fulfilled [12], i.e, they should be of zero memory and obeying time reversal (only those within classical mechanics or quantum mechanics without spin).

After the completion of this work, we learned that Rothman and Anninos [32] discussed a phase space approach (volumes below the Hamiltonians of the systems they study) to the “gravitational arrow of time” (which by definition is pointing in the direction of increased inhomogeneity).

Acknowledgment

We thank the Referee for suggestions, especially the Lax-Phillips argument. H.C. Rosu acknowledges partial support from CONACyT through the Project 4868-E9406.

References

- [1] For a book, see J.J. Halliwell, J. Perez-Mercader, and W.H. Zurek, eds., *The Physical Origin of Time-Asymmetry*, (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, England, 1994).
- [2] For a review see, M. Hillery, R.F. O’Connell, M.O. Scully and E.P. Wigner, *Phys. Rep.* **106**, 121 (1984).

- [3] For introductory presentations see, D.F. Walls, *Nature* **306**, 141 (1983); R.W. Henry and S.C. Glotzer, *Am. J. Phys.* **56**, 318 (1988); for a review see, R. Loudon and P.L. Knight, *J. Mod. Opt.* **34**, 709 (1987).
- [4] Ya.B. Zel'dovich, *JETP Lett.* **12**, 307 (1970).
- [5] L.P. Grishchuk, *Usp. Fiz. Nauk* **121**, 629 (1977).
- [6] L. Grishchuk, H.A. Haus and K. Bergman, *Phys. Rev.* **D46**, 1440 (1992).
- [7] L.P. Grishchuk and Yu.P. Sidorov, *Phys. Rev.* **D42**, 3413 (1990); *Class. Quant. Grav.* **6**, L161 (1989).
- [8] M. Gasperini and M. Giovannini, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **10**, L133 (1993); A. Albrecht, P. Ferreira, M. Joyce and T. Prokopec, *Phys. Rev.* **D50**, 4807 (1994); H.C. Rosu and M. Reyes, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **D4**, 327 (1995), and references therein.
- [9] A. Feinstein and M.A. Pérez Sebastián, “The origin of the entropy in the universe”, gr-qc/9610030 (unpublished).
- [10] A. Casher and F. Englert, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **9**, 2231 (1992).
- [11] B.L. Hu, G. Kang, and A. Matacz, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A9**, 991 (1994); A.L. Matacz, *Phys. Rev.* **D49**, 788 (1994); D. Koks, A. Matacz, B.L. Hu, *Phys. Rev.* **D55**, 5917 (1997).
- [12] H. Risken, *The Fokker-Planck equation* (Springer, 1984), see Supplement S.11 to the second edition and references therein.
- [13] B.L. Schumacher, *Phys. Rep.* **135**, 317 (1986).
- [14] E. Arthurs and J.L. Kelly, Jr., *Bell Syst. Tech. J.* **44**, 725 (1965); S.L. Braunstein, C.M. Caves and G.J. Milburn, *Phys. Rev.* **A43**, 1153 (1991).
- [15] C.H. Keitel and K. Wódkiewicz, *Phys. Lett.* **A167**, 151 (1992).
- [16] E.B. Davies, *One-parameter semigroups* (Academic Press, 1980).

- [17] D. Bohm, *Phys. Rev.* **85**, 166 and 180 (1952).
- [18] T. Banks, *Nucl. Phys.* **B249**, 332 (1985).
- [19] G. Horwitz, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **D5**, 885 (1996).
- [20] G.F. Smoot et al., *Astrophys. J.* **396**, L1 (1992); C.L. Bennett et al., *Astrophys. J.* **430**, 423 (1994).
- [21] M. Gasperini, M. Giovannini and G. Veneziano, *Phys. Rev.* **D52**, R6651 (1995).
- [22] B.R. Frieden, in *Advances in Imaging and Electron Physics*, edited by P.W. Hawkes (Academic Press, 1994) Vol. 90, pp. 123-204; *Physica* **A198**, 262 (1993).
- [23] H.L. Van Trees, *Detection, Estimation, and Modulation Theory, Part I* (Wiley, 1968).
- [24] B.R. Frieden and B.H. Soffer, *Phys. Rev.* **E52**, 2274 (1995).
- [25] A.R. Plastino and A. Plastino, *Phys. Rev.* **E54**, 4423 (1996).
- [26] B.R. Frieden, in preparation.
- [27] S. Winitzki and A. Vilenkin, *Phys. Rev.* **D53**, 4298 (1996); Y. Nambu and M. Sasaki, *Phys. Lett.* **B219**, 240 (1989), and references therein.
- [28] For a recent review, see R. Brout and R. Parentani, “Time in cosmology”, gr-qc/9705072 (unpublished). For an old review, see L. Smolin, “Time, measurement and information loss in quantum cosmology”, gr-qc/9301016 (in Brill fest book, Eds. B.L. Hu and T. Jacobson, Cambridge University Press, 1994). See also, A. Connes and C. Rovelli, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **11**, 2899 (1994).
- [29] P.D. Lax and R.S. Phillips, *Scattering Theory* (Academic Press, 1967).
- [30] H. Rosu, “Cosmological Levinson theorem”, gr-qc/9712072 (unpublished).
- [31] B.R. Frieden, “Sir Ronald Fisher and the demon of information physics”, (unpublished).
- [32] T. Rothman and P. Anninos, *Phys. Rev.* **D55**, 1948 (1997); *Phys. Lett. A* **224**, 227 (1997).